

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 3-26, and 28-52 are pending. Claims 1, 26, 51, and 52, which are independent, are hereby amended. Claims 2, 27, 53 and 54 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Support for this Amendment is provided through the Specification as originally filed, and specifically at page 64 and Figures 70-82.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 53 and 54 are hereby cancelled, thereby obviating the Double Patenting issue.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 52 has been amended thereby obviating the non-statutory subject matter rejection.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

The present amendment amends the claims to recite subject matter that is explicitly described throughout the specification and particularly at page 64. Thus, Applicants submit that the 112 issue is hereby overcome.

V. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-16, 18, 20, 22-26, 28-30, 32, 34-41, 43, 45, 47-50, and 51-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,356,903 (hereinafter “Baxter”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,742,816 (hereinafter “Barr”).

Claims 6, 8, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter in view of Barr and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,675 (hereinafter “Ryan”).

Claims 17, 19, 21, 42, 44, and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter in view of Barr and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,023,714 (hereinafter “Hill”).

As understood by Applicants, Baxter relates to a content management system for information delivery systems, including web-based systems, that organizes the content of the information separately from the appearance of the presented information.

As understood by Applicants, Barr relates to a method and apparatus for identifying textual documents and multimedia files corresponding to a search topic.

As understood by Applicants, Ryan relates to a method of updating an internet search engine database with the results of a user’s selection of specific web page listings from the general web page listing provided to the user as a result of his initial keyword search entry.

As understood by Applicants, Hill relates to dynamically adapting the layout of a document to a particular output device.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

A. Cited references fail to meet all claim limitations

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...**an external component, stored on an external database, the external component including an interface that is an entry point to an external component implementation, the external implementation providing content for inclusion in the web site...**” (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in Baxter, Barr, Ryan, or Hill, taken alone or in combination, that would teach or suggest the above-identified feature of claim 1. Specifically, neither Baxter, Barr, Ryan, nor Hill, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest an external component, stored on an external database, the external component including an interface that is an entry point to an external component implementation, the external implementation providing content for inclusion in the web site, as recited in claim 1.

Indeed, the Office Action relies on Baxter, column 5, line 58-column 6, line 11.

However, that portion of Baxter recites,

“The content and format stored in the **repository 60** are assembled by an assembly procedure 70 prior to being served to end users as web pages.

FIG. 3 is a block data flow diagram of the web based content management system shown in FIG. 2. Content design processes 72 and content creation processes 74 utilize creation tools 78 to create content and format components which are

stored in the repository 70.

A content management control processes 76 employs triggers (discussed hereinafter) for automated update processing and generally handles management and update of the content. If the content is an executable, such as with some Java applets or CGI scripts, an application services procedure 79 is provided to handle services related thereto.

The assembly procedure 70, in response to requests, **pulls the content and format components from the repository 60 and provides assembled web pages to a web site 80.** A web application 82, typically residing on a web server, acts as an interface. Web site management is a business function that typically works between the web site 80 and **the repository 60 to ensure that content and format are updated in an appropriate manner.**” (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the content management control process described in Baxter fails to teach or suggest an external component, stored on an external database, the external component including an interface that is an entry point to an external component implementation. Indeed, the repository 60, as described in Baxter is a database that stores content with organizational and format components (See Baxter col.5, lines 36-42) and does not teach or suggest the claimed external component. Specifically, the purpose of Baxter’s repository (60) is to store content and format that are assembled by an assembly procedure. This is necessary since Baxter describes a scenario in which the “content and the content’s organization and format are separably stored and maintained for subsequent real-time assembly.” (See Baxter, column 4, lines 25-28). Applicants submit that the repository (60) of Baxter is distinguished from the external component as recited in claim 1 since the repository (60) of Baxter is not an external database (See Figure 2 of Baxter).

B. Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness

Applicants submit that the Office Action has not provided adequate basis for combining the references, as required. Applicants submit that the Office Action has not provided any explanation of the reasoning that leads to a legal conclusion of obviousness. Indeed, statements provided on page 5 merely state a conclusion and do not provide any basis for the combination.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, independent claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claims 26, 51 and 52 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope and are therefore patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

VI. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800